

### REMARKS

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-20 are currently pending in the subject application. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim. Claim 1 is amended by the instant amendment.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed on November 17, 2003. It is assumed that applicants' arguments set forth in the amendment filed November 3, 2005, overcame the Examiner's objections to the drawings.

Claims 1-20 are presented to the Examiner for further prosecution on the merits.

#### A. Introduction

In the outstanding Office action, mailed January 25, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 01/43857 to Ehrfeld et al. ("the Ehrfeld et al. reference"), and rejected claims 8, 9, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Ehrfeld et al. reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,001,267 to Os ("the Os reference").

#### B. Asserted Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1-7, 10-15 and 17-19

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Ehrfeld et al. reference. Claim 1 is amended by the instant amendment. Applicants respectfully submit that the Ehrfeld et al. reference fails to disclose, or even suggest, each and every element of claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth below.

For example, claim 1 presently recites, "... wherein all surfaces defining the gas channels have a full extent defined by a surface of the injector and a surface of the reaction chamber." In contrast, the Ehrfeld et al. reference discloses, at most, gas channels having a

substantial extent defined solely by a surface of the injector. That is, referring to, e.g., FIG. 1a of the Ehrfeld et al. reference, the Ehrfeld et al. reference discloses that the microchannels 31-34 are defined by adjacent portions 2a-d of the injector 3. Therefore, the Ehrfeld et al. reference fails to disclose, or even suggest, gas channels having a full extent defined by a surface of the injector and a surface of the reaction chamber, as presently recited in claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the Ehrfeld et al. reference and, as claims 2-7, 10-15 and 17-19 depend from claim 1, they are believed to be similarly allowable. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

C. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 8, 9, 16 and 20

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, 16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Ehrfeld et al. reference in view of the Os et al. reference. As noted above, applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the Ehrfeld et al. reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the Os et al. reference fails to provide the teachings that are missing from the Ehrfeld et al. reference. Accordingly, as claims 8, 9, 16 and 20 depend from claim 1, these claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

D. Conclusion


If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: April 25, 2006

  
Eugene M. Lee, Reg No. 52,039

**LEE & MORSE, P.C.**

1101 WILSON BOULEVARD, SUITE 2000  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209  
703.525.0978 TEL  
703.525.4265 FAX

**PETITION and**  
**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION**

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.